DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 676 EA 012 610

AUTHOR Shefter, Jan; And Others
TITLE History and Development of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION NTS Research Corp., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 80
CONTRACT 100-80-0128
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980). For related documents, see EA 012 611-612.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Equal Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *Planning; Postsecondary Education; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS Education Amendments 1972; *Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper, one of three related documents, is to describe the events leading to the creation and organization of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, which was authorized by Congress in 1972 through the Educational Amendments Act. The legislative mandate for the fund was to improve postsecondary educational opportunities with an initial appropriation of $10 million. The first section of the paper describes the expansion of Federal involvement in higher education that eventually led to the fund. The second section describes the internal planning that took place in preparation for the agency's establishment. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
Boston, Massachusetts
April 6-11, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED185676

EA 012 610

NTS Research Corporation
2634 Chapel Hill Boulevard
Durham, North Carolina 27707
(919) 493-3451

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

DRAFT

History and Development of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

Jan Shefter, Diane Pelavin, and
Martin Orland

NTS Research Corporation
Durham, North Carolina

Presented at
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
April 1980
Boston, Massachusetts

Research reported in this paper was supported under Contract # HEW-100-80-0128 for the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW.

HISTORY IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Introduction

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (the Fund) was authorized by Congress in June 1972 by the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 (P.L.94-318). The Fund's broad legislative mandate is 'to improve postsecondary educational opportunities." The initial appropriation for the Fund of $10 million was made in January 1973, with the first grants awarded that spring. The purpose of this paper is to describe the events leading to the Fund's creation and organization. The first section describes the expansion of Federal involvement in higher education which eventually led to the Fund. The second section describes the internal planning that took place in preparation for the agency's establishment.

Legislative History

With the influx of veterans to college after World War II, the field of higher education began to change. The first manifestation of this change was the Serviceman's Readjustment Act (SRA) of 1944, which offered many veterans the opportunity to obtain a college education. The SRA was only the second instance in which the Federal government became involved in higher education in a major way.[1] The SRA set the stage for much of the legislation which followed and for the thinking that brought about the concept of the Fund.

---

[1]The first instance was the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 which provided each state with the means of supporting agricultural and industrial education.

The shift in public thought from a position dictating that the Federal government maintain a "hands-off" attitude toward higher education to a view that government should provide more direct and extensive financial aid to colleges and universities intensified through the 1940s. A reflection of this shift was President Truman's appointment in 1946 of a commission chaired by George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, to "re-examine our system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, and facilities; and in light of the social role it has to play" (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). In its final report, published in 1946, the Zook commission made several recommendations, most of which are now part of the fabric of Federal legislation affecting postsecondary education.

The Commission's primary accomplishment was to propose the means by which all barriers[2] to educational opportunity could be quickly abolished. First, the Commission recommended that each state establish a community college system as part of its public school system, providing free or low-cost education through the sophomore year of college. In addition, the Commission recommended that a program of Federal financial aid be established to assist nonveteran students and that "specific legislation be passed to prevent racial and religious discrimination in the selection of college and university students" (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). In order to assist the public institutions in meeting the needs of this diverse and numerous student body, the Commission completed its package by recommending that Federal financial aid be appropriated to the states for distribution to their institutions, and that Federal grants also be given to some of these institutions for capital outlay.

[2]These barriers were identified as being economic, racial, religious, and geographical in nature.

The Zook Commission's report, Higher Education for American Democracy, inspired great concern and debate within the higher education community. However, little was done to implement the recommendations of the Commission until 1958. At that time the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed. The Act, largely motivated by the launching of Sputnik, established several programs of Federal aid to higher education that were similar to the type recommended by the Zook Commission. The NDEA was the first omnibus education bill.

The next step in the process which set the stage for the Fund was an increase in Federal attention to the problems and concerns of higher education following passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Attention was directed to such issues as teacher qualifications, talent loss, growth of the American college population, crowded and inadequate facilities, deficient library resources, and insufficient scholarship funds (House Report 621). The resolution of these problems was thought to be critical to national survival in that the maintenance of equality and quality of educational opportunities was essential to a democracy (Muirhead, 1964). Thus, President Johnson recommended and Congress passed the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, which included provisions for:

- awarding scholarships for needy and qualified high school students to enable them to enter and then continue in college;
- expanding the college work-study program which was moved from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education;
- paying part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students by the Federal government;
- aiding colleges and universities in the purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research;
- strengthening less developed colleges; and
- awarding of grants to support university extension, concentrating on the problems of the community (Congressional Record, 1965).

The HEA of 1965 extended the opportunity of equal education to hundreds of potential students who previously would have been unable to enter college and continue their education.

However, by the late 1960s, a new set of problems had arisen. Many educators had become convinced that traditional approaches to postsecondary education were inadequate to meet the education needs and expectations of large segments of the population. It was alleged that nontraditional students, such as members of racial or ethnic minorities, the geographically isolated, adults with family or job responsibilities, and the aged, often did not fit well into the traditional settings of postsecondary education. Furthermore, it was charged that postsecondary education tended to remain inflexible, continuing to focus its services on a largely full-time student population.

When he became President in 1969, Richard M. Nixon undertook an examination of the status of higher education. His first step was to appoint a White House working group with representatives appointed from the Office of Education, the Office of the Secretary of DHEW, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisors, the Department of Labor, the Office of Science and Technology, and the White House. This group was assigned "to shape the administration's alternatives in higher education and to make recommendations to the President." A variety of issues occupied the meetings of the White House working group. From these meetings, a proposed program was articulated which focused on seven major components. Foremost among these were a new student aid program and support for academic excellence. Other components included aid for black colleges, aid for reform and innovation, institutional aid, consolidation of small Federal programs, and affirmation of autonomy for higher education financed by Federal money.

The program was to be administered by a newly created Federal agency, the National Foundation for Higher Education, which would not be part of either the Office of Education or DHEW. Rather, the new agency would be autonomous like the National Science Foundation (NSF), and would be similarly organized. The proponents of the Higher Education Foundation viewed NSF as a successful example of a Federally sponsored foundation model for causing innovation. NSF was considered by these backers to possess the following characteristics which they proposed be emulated in the Foundation:

- a strong, autonomous and politically independent Board of Directors setting general Foundation policy;
- a commitment to support, on a relatively short-term basis, promising initiatives developed in the field; and
- some latitude from normal civil service procedures in personnel hiring practices (Internal memoranda, October 15, 1971).

The Higher Education Foundation proposal was introduced in Congress in March 1970 as a key feature of the Administration's higher education program.[3] Its principal purposes were the following:

- to provide a source of funds for the support of excellence, new ideas and reform in education, with funding to be based on the quality of the applicant institutions and programs;
- to strengthen the instruction available in American higher education and to provide support for institutions facing special difficulties; and
- to provide an organization concerned at the highest level with the development of national policy in higher education. Initial funding of $200 million was proposed the first year (Kerr, 1971).

The proponents of the proposed Foundation envisioned its autonomy and non-categorical grants system as strengths, and believed it would be totally accepted by the higher education community. After all, the proposal closely

---

[3]"The other major features were a reform of student financial aid, the creation of a secondary loan market mechanism and a small program to assist junior colleges" (Finn, 1972).

followed the popular recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, which had proposed "the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education whose functions would be to encourage, advise, review and provide financial support for institutional programs designed to give new direction in curricula, to strengthen essential areas that have fallen behind or never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and to develop programs for improvement of educational processes and techniques."

However, the working group had erred in two major ways: First, they assumed the Carnegie Commission spoke for all of higher education. Second, they developed the idea for a higher education foundation in isolation from the higher education community. For these reasons, the Foundation did not receive the support of leading higher education lobbyists, particularly the American Council on Education. Although Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Commission, did write supportive letters and articles, the Commission itself never publicly supported the Administration's proposal.

In addition, the Foundation proposal also failed to receive the backing of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Because several of DHEW's programs were to be consolidated under the Foundation's aegis, the Office of Education's role in higher education would be substantially reduced. For this reason DHEW withheld support from the proposed Foundation.

Not anticipating this reaction to its higher education initiative, the administration failed to provide strong support for the Higher Education Foundation. Furthermore, it failed to clarify to Congress the differences between the Foundation and the proposed National Institute of Education. Both proposals contained language about experimentation and reform. The Institute was to conduct research primarily on elementary and secondary education but was not prohibited from conducting research in higher education. The overlap in general

focus of the two proposals presented many gray areas, which opponents of the Foundation used to create confusion. Even though several attempts were made during 1970 to amend the Administration's bill, Congress took no action and largely ignored the proposal. The proposal never emerged from Congressional committee.

A sharply revamped proposal for a higher education Foundation was presented to Congress by the Nixon administration in March 1971. This time, the chief architects of the bill were from DHEW rather than the White House, and the proposal was submitted as a part of a much larger higher education bill. The new proposal retained much of the basic NSF structure for the Foundation, but limited its substantive concerns almost exclusively to reform and innovation in higher education. Gone were the attempts to consolidate existing DHEW programs in the new Foundation and to support the black colleges as a categorical group. Furthermore, the proposed Foundation was no longer to be an independent entity, but rather would exist as a unit within DHEW at the same level as the Office of Education and the proposed National Institute of Education (Finn, 1972).

The major impetus for increased interest in the Foundation at this time was the release of the Newman Report on Higher Education in 1971 (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976). This report was the product of a task force in higher education appointed in 1970 by DHEW Secretary Robert Finch and chaired by Frank Newman, who was then director of university relations at Stanford University. The Newman Report argued that merely increasing access to education cannot assure the quality of education available to students. The report also identified several problems facing higher education:

- Most higher education institutions were more concerned with gaining prestige through research than with providing effective instruction;

- The development of statewide systems of higher education was reducing the opportunities available to each campus for exploring new directions;
- Students no longer had a choice among diverse institutions of higher education;
- Students and faculty needed more experiences away from the campuses in order to determine what a relevant education is;
- The academic community needed to learn how to utilize its resources more effectively;
- Community colleges needed the opportunity to develop missions of their own.

According to the report,

> ...the foremost task for public policy is to create conditions under which new educational enterprises can be founded and can endure...specific programs of funding [should] be established that are directed exclusively to encouraging new enterprises. The most effective form of such funding would be special programs that allow educational enterpreneurs direct access to competitive grants. These grants should be awarded in response to the best proposals, and made for a sufficient time span to prove out a new approach (Newman, 1971).

The report concluded that the support of projects with Federal grants would be the most effective means of encouraging attempts at change.

The Senate approved a modified version of the Administration's proposal for the higher education Foundation in August 1972. The Senate's modifications included:

- broadening the target population to encompass all of "post-secondary" education rather than only higher education;
- changing the name of the Foundation to the National Foundation for Postsecondary Education (NFPE);
- relocating the NFPE within a new division of education such that the NFPE would have the same organizational status as the Office of Education and the newly created National Institute of Education; and
- strengthening the proposed advisory board by changing it to a board of directors that would establish and review the NFPE's general policies and practices.

The purposes of the NFPE were:

(A) to encourage excellence, innovation, and reform in education;

(B) to provide assistance for the design and establishment of innovative structures for providing postsecondary education and innovative modes of teaching and learning therein;

(C) to expand the ways and patterns of acquiring postsecondary education and to open opportunities for such education to individuals of all ages and circumstances;

(D) to strengthen the autonomy, the individuality, and sense of mission of postsecondary educational institutions, and to support programs which are distinctive or of special value to American society; and

(E) to encourage postsecondary educational institutions to develop policies, programs, and practices responsive to social needs, and provide an organization concerned with the rationalization of public policies toward postsecondary education (Bunting, 1971).

As these purposes suggest, the Foundation was to be empowered to fund nearly anyone for nearly any purpose having to do with advancing "excellence, innovation or reform" in postsecondary education.

The Administration's revamped 1971 proposal for the creation of the Higher Education Foundation, however, was still not strongly supported in the House, where John Brandemas, chairman of the new Special Subcommittee on Education, let it be known that he was not in favor of such a Federal agency in any form. The House did not include the Foundation in its legislative package. Thus, the Foundation's outcome was left to the Senate-House Conference (Finn, 1972).[4]

The Conference committee eventually reached a compromise which permitted establishment of the Foundation but in a drastically altered structure with greatly reduced funding authorization. As shown in Figure 1, Section 404 of the

---

[4]The Foundation was not a priority item in the education bill for 1972. At the time, there were other more pressing concerns, such as the issue of busing, (which dominated debate to the extent that the entire legislation was referred to as a Busing Bill), the expansion of Federally supported student aid (through the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, College Work-Study, Direct Student Loans, and Guaranteed Student Loans) and the proposed Emergency School Aid Act, which would provide financial support to assist schools in their desegregation efforts.

Figure 1

Educational Amendments of 1972

Public Law 92-318-June 23, 1972

SUPPORT FOR IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Sec. 404. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of postsecondary education (including combinations of such institutions) and other public and private educational institutions and agencies (except that no grant shall be made to an educational institution or agency other than a nonprofit institution or agency) to improve postsecondary educational opportunities by providing assistance to such educational institutions and agencies for--

(1) encouraging the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education, and providing equal educational opportunity for all;
(2) the creation of institutions and programs involving new paths to career and professional training, and new combinations of academic and experiential learning;
(3) the establishment of institutions and programs based on the technology of communications;
(4) the carrying out in postsecondary educational institutions of changes in internal structure and operations designed to clarify institutional priorities and purposes;
(5) the design and introduction of cost-effective methods of institution and operation;
(6) the introduction of institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and reentering institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs;
(7) the introduction of reforms in graduate education, in the structure of academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculties; and
(8) the creation of new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and the introduction of reforms in current institutional practices related thereto. (Title III, Section 404 of the General Education Provision Act, as amended by the Educational Amendments Act of 1972.)

(b) No grant shall be made or contract entered into under subsection (a) for a project or program with any institution of postsecondary education unless it has been submitted to each appropriate State Commission established under section 1202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and an opportunity afforded such Commission to submit its comments and recommendations to the Secretary.

Figure 1 (Continued)

(c) For the purposes of this section, the authority granted to the Commissioner in part D of this Act shall apply to the Secretary.

(d) The Secretary may appoint, for terms not to exceed three years, without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service, not more than five technical employees to administer this section who may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for the purposes of this section.

compromise legislation, entitled "Support for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education," listed eight purposes and described a few personnel matters. Gone were any references to a "Foundation"; the NFPE had been reduced to a government program. Organizationally, the "modified Foundation" was assigned to the Secretary of DHEW. However, the legislation did not restrict the Secretary from assigning the new program to another office within DHEW. The first three years' authorizations were set at 10, 50, and 75 million dollars.

The Conference Bill, known as the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (P.L. 94-318), was passed on June 22, 1972, and President Nixon signed it into law on July 6. It was now left to the Secretary and his staff to consider the issues associated with implementing a new program.

Internal Planning for the Fund

DHEW Task Force

While Congress was considering the existence of the proposed National Foundation for Postsecondary Education, a special task force was established within DHEW to develop plans and guidelines for its implementation. The NFPE task force was formed in September 1971 and was composed of reassigned DHEW staff from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), the Office of Education (OE), and the Assistant Secretary for Legislation (ASL). Although OE was formally designated as the lead agency, the main thrust for the DHEW planning effort came from ASPE, with OE and ASL giving their support (Bunting, 1971).

The task force developed a rationale for supporting a semi-autonomous agency within DHEW, modeled on the foundation approach. This foundation approach would provide "seed money" support for projects having high potential for improving postsecondary education. The task force recognized that no Federal mechanism

existed to provide aid to postsecondary institutions in developing innovative programs, and, furthermore, that Federal support of innovative programs in general had up to this point been somewhat haphazard and accidental. Using a foundation model, which would encourage innovation without dictating what these innovations were to be, the Federal government could offer leadership in facilitating reform and improvement of postsecondary education.

The task force concluded that the DHEW foundation, unlike the National Science Foundation or the National Endowment for the Humanities, should be noncategorical.[5] It was felt that categorical funding would stifle the thinking needed to transcend the artificial boundaries that existed in postsecondary education.

In establishing plans and guidelines for the Foundation, the task force was sensitive to a number of problems. The issue of responsiveness to the needs of the field required a great deal of consideration. The Foundation would have to formulate procedures to encourage the development of approaches which were motivated by and could meet the current needs of people involved in postsecondary education. Yet this responsiveness could not be so passive as to exclude current or future needs for which the field presented no ideas.

Another important issue was the best method for achieving maximum impact. In the judgment of the task force, the DHEW Foundation needed to serve a broad spectrum of people without spreading its resources so thin as to lack impact. To maximize its impact, the Foundation would have to act as a catalyst, providing small amounts of money only to those projects which had the best potential for high returns.

---

[5]At that time, the National Science Foundation could fund only science-oriented programs; it could not fund a program combining science and the humanities. Similarly, the National Endowment for the Humanities could fund only humanities programs.

An additional dilemma with which the Foundation would have to cope would be caused by its very purpose of supporting innovative, risk-taking projects. Some projects might fail; some might be politically unpopular; some might seem procedurally chaotic. It was suggested that one of the measures of the program's success would be its ability to maintain a risk-taking posture in the face of internal and external pressure (Bunting, Justice, O'Keefe, 1972).

Implementation Group

After the passage of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, DHEW Secretary Richardson appointed Russell Edgerton as head of a group charged with implementing the new program, which was, as yet, unamed. Edgerton had served on the Newman task force, and then had represented ASPE on the DHEW task force.

In order to develop a report on the specific organizational issues and options which DHEW had to consider in implementing the new program, Edgerton conducted a series of meetings. In October 1972 Sidney Marland, the Commissioner of Education, met with a group of educational leaders to discuss the implementation issues which Edgerton had identified, and to prepare recommendations.[6] The group considered alternative resolutions to six fundamental issues. These alternatives and the group's recommendation were presented to Secretary Richardson in a November 1, 1972, memorandum from Commissioner Marland.

---

[6]Those involved in the meeting were: Roger W. Heyns, President, American Council on Education; Morris Keeton, President, American Association of Higher Education; G. Theodore Mitau, Chancellor, Minnesota State College System; Richard Hagemeyer, President, Central Piedmont Community College; K. Patricia Cross, Senior Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service; Virginia B. Smith, Associate Director, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; Samuel Baskin, President, Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities; Frank Newman, Chairman of the Newman Report and Director of University Relations, Stanford University; and Elias Blake, President, Institute for Services to Education.

The first issue was to determine the kind of funding mechanism that should be established to award the grants. The alternatives were:

- A foundation based on the concept of responsiveness to externally initiated proposals. The staff would be small and would report to a strong and active Board.
- A categorical program aimed at selecting specific areas of reform and innovation for funding. Proposals would be solicited along nine specific guidelines. The overall program would be defined more narrowly and would be less ambitious than the foundation concept.
- A discretionary fund program in which guidelines would be general and priorities would be determined by DHEW, sometimes in response to long-range plans and sometimes in response to particular needs.

In accordance with previous DHEW recommendations that the new agency should "...respond rather than initiate; facilitate others to act rather than act itself; and encourage and influence reform and experimentation rather than direct such activities" (Kerr, 1971), the foundation approach was recommended. In addition, the group recommended that the vehicle through which the support should be channeled be referred to as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (the Fund).

The second issue was how the first-year priorities of the Fund should be established. As the group recognized, "every comprehensive report on postsecondary education in recent years has stressed the need for encouraging openness, flexibility, diversity, life-long learning, and cost effectiveness in postsecondary education" (Internal memorandum, Marland, November 1, 1972). Three alternatives were considered:

- Guidelines could be written that simply identified the interest of the Fund in proposals concerned with the improvement of postsecondary education.
- Guidelines could be written defining broad social priorities the Fund would pursue, while leaving the Board maximum discretion in defining programs and reviewing specific projects.

- Guidelines could be written defining specific programs the Fund would pursue.

The group chose the second alternative, believing that it provided the necessary guidance from DHEW while allowing the Director and Board freedom to make decisions on specific programs and projects. This alternative appeared "to provide guidance to those searching for signals about the priorities of the Fund while giving maximum encouragement to creative thinking rather than fitting proposals to guidelines" (Internal memorandum, Marland, November 1, 1972).

A third issue was the administrative placement of the Fund within DHEW. The enacting legislation had placed the authority for the Fund with the Secretary. However, as an administrative unit it could be placed in any of three different areas: the Office of the Secretary; the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education; or the Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education within the Office of Education. The recommendation was that administrative authority be delegated to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education. It was felt that this choice:

- increased the possibility of coordination with NIE, as well as NSF, the National Endowment, and other agencies outside DHEW;
- increased the likelihood that constituencies other than existing colleges and universities would be taken into account; and
- satisfied Congressional intent expressed in the legislative history of the Foundation . . . and the subsequent views expressed by the supporters of the Fund on the Hill (and in OMB and the higher education community), all of which pointed toward an organizationally independent Fund reporting to ASE or perhaps the Secretary (Internal memorandum, Marland, November 1, 1972).

The fourth issue focused on the Conference Committee report statement that the Secretary should appoint "an advisory committee to assist in the policymaking and administration of the new program." The group recommended a strong advisory board which could exercise control over policy and review or disapprove programs.

Following this decision, two alternatives for composition of the board were considered:

- The Board could be composed exclusively of public interest representatives.
- The Board could be composed essentially of public interest representatives, with the others representing educational interests broadly defined to include students, teaching faculties, administrators, and educational professionals in research and service agencies (Internal memorandum, Marland, November 1, 1972).

The recommendation was to select a Board that would be a mixture of members representing both public and educational interests. This type of Board would assure the openness of the Fund to groups other than the traditional institutions of higher education. Specifically, the recommendation was that at least eight Board members represent public interests and up to seven represent educational institutions or professionals in the field of education.

The final issue was the type and level of appointment for the Director. The enacting legislation provided for five positions which would be exempt from the regulations of the Civil Service. It did not, however, specifically provide for a Director. Three alternatives were considered:

- Appointment to a Schedule C supergrade (GS-16-17) position;
- Appointment to an exempted position at a salary equivalent to a GS-16 or 17; and
- Appointment to a nonsupergrade and/or permanent Civil Service position.

The recommendation was appointment of the Director to a Schedule C supergrade. This level of appointment was thought to be consistent with the importance of the Director's role; it offered a salary comparable to that of an academic vice president at a major educational institution.

In early December all of Marland's recommendations were accepted by the Secretary. By January 1973, the budget of $10 million for FY 1973[7] had been approved by Congress, and the Fund's first Director, Dr. Virginia Smith, had been informally approved for appointment by the Administration. Eight staff members were appointed, four of whom had been involved in planning for the foundation: Russell Edgerton, Carol Stoel, David Justice, and Chuck Bunting. Grant requests from the field were received in February and awards were made by June 30, 1973.

Summary

As an outgrowth of the Foundation's legislative history, the problems identified by the DHEW planning task force, and the recommendations of educational leaders, the new agency was organized on the following paradigm:

- the agency's service mandate was considered comprehensive, covering the entire range of postsecondary education institutions. This includes not only four-year and graduate institutions, but proprietory schools, community colleges, technical institutes, museums, zoos, libraries, community-based organizations, research organizations, service and professional organizations, and a whole list of institutions and agencies capable of delivering postsecondary educational services, that is, education beyond the high school;
- the agency would be responsive to the field of postsecondary education, leaving critical decisions regarding the project design and implementation to the applicant;
- the agency would be action oriented rather than research oriented;
- the agency would be risk-taking, accepting proposals for new and unproven ideas as well as proven ideas at new places (Bunting, 1975).

In February 1973, the Fund had published and distributed its "Program Information and Application Procedures" (usually referred to as "the Fund's

[7] FY, or fiscal year, refers to the government funding year, rather than the calendar year.

guidelines"). The guidelines included a brief description of the Fund, a list of the Fund's eight legislatively mandated purposes, and a description of "five broad areas within which the Fund will be especially interested in receiving proposals" (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education: Program Information and Application Procedures, 1973.) The guidelines indicated that the five areas were not mutually exclusive, but that each area defined "a set of problems and directions which might be taken to improve postsecondary educational opportunities." The five areas were:

- New Approaches to Teaching and Learning,
- Implementing Equal Educational Opportunity,
- Revitalizing Institutional Missions,
- New Educational Missions, and
- Encouraging an Open System.

Since 1973, these areas of interest have been altered and expanded. Changes in the Fund's areas of interest were made to encourage the submission of proposals that addressed either neglected areas or newly identified areas of need within the mandated purposes. Regardless of these changes, however, the guidelines have continued to strongly reflect the purpose of providing equal educational opportunity.

By 1976, the Fund's guidelines described the following eight possible directions for improvements in postsecondary education:

- Extending effective educational opportunity to those still not adequately served by the system,
- Meeting individual needs in a mass system,
- Improving programs, personnel and instruction for more effective education,
- Creating and applying more meaningful criteria for the award of postsecondary credentials,

- Reducing costs and stretching the educational dollar,
- Making better use of educational resources beyond colleges and universities,
- Helping people make better choices about whether, when, and where to enroll in education beyond high school, and
- Preserving institutional vitality in the face of growing rigidity and regulation.

The Fund Today

The Fund's budget (Congressional appropriation) has grown slowly. Beginning with $10 million for FY 73, the Fund's budget has increased to approximately $13 million. Even so, this amount represents a very small proportion of total Federal expenditures for postsecondary education.

In conclusion, the Fund was the result of years of thought, but not of special, vested interest. It was and still is a "test" for a Federal agency. One measure of its success and of its ability to encourage innovation is represented by the awards given by the Academy for Educational Development in recognition of "innovative solutions to critical problems in higher education." Of the 12 institutions which received the award in 1979, the Fund was instrumental in initiating the programs in seven of them.

References

Brodinsky, Ben. 12 Major events that shaped America's schools, Phi Delta Kappan. September 1976, 68-77.

Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Bunting, Charles I. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, American Education, June 1975.

Bunting, Charles I. An Analysis of a Legislative Proposal (1971): The National Foundation for Postsecondary Education. Boston, MA: Harvard University (1973), unpublished dissertation.

Bunting, Charles I; Justice, David; and O'Keefe, Mike. A Grants Management Process for Innovation and Reform in Postsecondary Education. U.S. Office of Education, May 1972.

Finn, Chester, Jr. The National Foundation for Higher Education: Death of an idea. Change, 4(2), March 1972, 22-31.

Gladieux, Lawrence E. and Wolanin, Thomas R. Congress and the Colleges: The National Politics of Higher Education. Lexington, MA: Lexington Book, 1976.

Internal Memorandum. Papers on National Foundation for Higher Education. From Bernard H. Martin. October 15, 1971.

Internal Memorandum. Implementation of authority for the improvement of postsecondary education-ACTION. From the Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot Richardson. November 1, 1972.

Kerr, Clark. Washington: National Foundation for Higher Education, Change, May-June 1971.

Muirhead, Peter P. The Federal interest in education. College and University. 39 (Summer 1974): 433-441.

Report on Higher Education (Newman Report). Frank Newman. Chairman, March 191. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, No. HE5.250:50065.

Twelve institutions win $10,000 apiece for "innovative solutions" to problems. The Chronicle of Higher Education. May 29, 1979.

U.S. Congress House. Higher Education Act of 1965. H.R. 621, 89th Congress, 1st session, 1965.

NTS Paper Presentations at AERA 1980

"A New Model for Federal Change Agent Programs", Sol H. Pelavin*

22.14/Table 4 (Individually Scheduled Papers Division G, and Division A), Thursday Morning, 8:45-9:30, Civic Center (Room 200, 3rd Floor).

"An Empirical Comparison of Four Indicators of Test Speededness", Nick Maruhnich*

Session: 23.12/Effects from Bias, Test-Wiseness, Speededness and Guessing (Critique, Division D), Thursday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"Assessing and Improving the Accuracy of Title I Evaluation with Grade-Appropriate Tests", Edward Moran, West Virginia Department of Education; Robert F. Baker* and Nick Maruhnich*

Session: 23.13/Methods of Program Evaluation (Paper Presentation, Division D), Thursday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Dalton Room, 3rd Floor)

"Policy Implications Analysis", Michael Everett, Indiana University; A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 23.20/Evaluation Potpourri (Critique, Division H), Thursday Morning, 10:45-12:05, Sheraton (Gardner, 3rd Floor)

"An Application of Psychometric Procedures in the Non-Psychological Domain: Development of Dissemination System Scales Using Classical Test Theory and Rasch Scaling Techniques", Robert F. Baker*, Jolinda K. Decad*, Doren L. Madey*, and A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 24.19/Applications of Latent Trait Theory, Sequential Analysis and Multi Dimensional Scaling, (Paper Presentation, Division D), Thursday Afternoon, 12:35-1:55, Sheraton (Beacon F, 3rd Floor)

"Tuition Assistance and Income Neutrality in College Choice", William Shaut, State University of New York, Central Administration; Robert J. Goettel*

Session: 24.31/The Impact of Student Financial Aid on Postsecondary Education (Critique, SIG/Postsecondary Education), Thursday Afternoon, 12:25-1:55, Civic Center (Revere, 3rd Floor).

"Evaluating Title I Early Childhood Programs: Problems, the Applicability of Model C, and Several Evaluation Plans", Keith McNeil* and Emily A. Findlay*

Session: 26.05/Multiple Regression Analysis - Application and Interpretation (Symposium, SIG/Multiple Linear Regression), Thursday Afternoon, 4:05-6:05, Sheraton (Constitution, 2nd Floor)

Discussant: Judy McNeil*

*NTS Employees

"Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: An Overview of Present Status", Joseph F. Haenn*

"Developing Empirical Descriptions of Educational Linkage Agents", Doren L. Madey* and Robert F. Baker*

Session: 3.11/ Perspectives on Knowledge Utilization at the System, Organizational and Individual Levels (Critique, SIG/Research Utilization), Monday Afternoon, 4:05-5:35, Sheraton (Exeter, 3rd Floor).

"State Grants for Capacity Building in Dissemination", Eugene C. Royster*

Session: 5.18/Relating Research to Policy on Dissemination Symposium, Division A), Tuesday Morning, 8:15-10:15, Sheraton (Beacon G, 3rd Floor).

"Effects of Magnet School Enrollment Changes on Desegregation", John C. Larson, Montgomery County Schools; Eugene C. Royster*

Session: 6.10/Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Desegregation (Paper Presentation, Division G), Tuesday Morning, 8:45-10:15, Civic Center (Room 202, 3rd Floor).

"The Distributions of NCE, Percentile and Grade Equivalent Scores Among Twelve Nationally Standardized Achievement Tests", Thomas B. Williams*

Session: 6.12/Achievement Testing: Methodological Issues (Critique, Division H), Tuesday Morning, 8:45-10:15, Civic Center (Revere, 3rd Floor).

"History and Development of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education", Jan Shefter*, Diane Pelavin*, and Martin Orland*

"An Analysis of the Fund's Comprehensive Grant Program", Becky Jon Hayward*, Dan Johnston* and Diane Pelavin*

"An Analysis of the Achievements and Impacts of the Fund's Projects", Diane Pelavin*, Dan Johnston* and Jan Shefter*

"An Analysis of the Fund's Managemet Strategy", Martin Orland*, Becky Jon Hayward* and Jan Shefter*

"Hypotheses About the Successes of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education", Sol H. Pelavin*, Martin Orland* and Becky Jon Hayward*

Session: 17.22/A Study of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Symposium, SIG/Postsecondary Education), Wednesday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Sheraton (Beacon F, 3rd Floor).

*NTS Employees

"Reasons Why Testing and Evaluations Don't Inform", Joseph F. Haenn*

Session: 28.19/SEA and LEA Strategies to Use Testing and Evaluation Information for Local School Improvement (Symposium, Division H), Friday Morning, 8:15-10:15, Sheraton (Constitution, 2nd Floor)

Critic: Robert J. Goettel*

"The Regression Route to Reliability Coefficients", Bob Burton, Applied Management Sciences; A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 30.13/Test Reliability (Critique, Division D), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"What is Educational Significance?", Michael B. Bunch*

Session: 30.20/Evaluation Research: Impact on Policy (Critique, Division H), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Gardner, 3rd Floor)

"Toward a Conceptual Framework for Understanding State and Local Implementation of Federal Aid Programs in Education", Martin E. Orland* and Robert J. Goettel*

Session: 30.22/Implementing Organizational Change (Paper Presentation, Division A), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Beacon G, 3rd Floor)

"Test Item Development: An Empirical Study of Practical Problems", Nick Maruhnich* and Thomas Dunning*

Session: 32.09/Issues in Test Construction and Interpretation (Paper Presentation, Division D), Friday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"Identification of Oral Communication Skills in Children and an Analysis of Developmental Differences in Performance", Jolinda K. Decad*

Session: 32.18/Oral Reading and Oral Communication in Children (Critique, Division C), Friday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Civic Center (Hancock, 3rd Floor)

*NTS Employees

NTS RESEARCH CORPORATION

NTS Research Corporation is a private corporation specializing in research and development, policy analysis, test scoring services, and market and survey analysis for Federal, state and local agencies as well as business and industry. Founded in 1973, NTS is a rapidly growing and vital company that reflects the research and development community in which it exists. Located in Durham, North Carolina, near Duke University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina State University, and the Research Triangle Park, a nationally renowned research center, NTS complements its own highly skilled professional staff with the services of both local and national experts.

NTS has over 90 staff organized into two major divisions, Social Science and Research Science, with seven operating centers, including Educational Research, Human Development, Health Studies, Operations Research and Data Processing, Statistical and Sampling Research, Market Research and Survey Operations, and Measurement and Data Management. Activities of these centers span the full range of contract research including program evaluation, technical assistance and training.

NTS corporate structure, management, personnel, and diverse resources contribute to the successful performance of all contracts. The strength and breadth of NTS corporate capability is represented by an experienced, highly qualified staff. In addition to advanced educational degrees, the staff possesses a range of technical and interpersonal skills as well as extensive experience in current social and educational issues. Through this staff, NTS combines rigorous scholarship with an active problem-solving orientation in its training, technical assistance, and research and development activities.

Below is a brief listing of some recent and continuing NTS contracts:

- Educational Policy Development Center for Educational Quality and Improvement.
  Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/Policy Development.
- Evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.
  Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Evaluation of State Dissemination Grants Program for Capacity Building.
  National Institute of Education.
- Evaluation of Urban Area Experience-Based Career Education Program.
  Office of Career Education, US Office of Education.
- Follow-Up Study of Patients Who Had I-131 and Other Diagnostic Procedures During Childhood.
  DHEW/FDA Bureau of Radiological Health.
- National Evaluation of Headstart Educational Services.
  Administration for Children, Youth and Families.
- Operation of the ESEA Title I Technical Assistance Center, HEW Region III.
  Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, US Office of Education.
- Delaware Item Pool Development.
  Delaware State Department of Public Instruction.
- Evaluation of the Comprehensive Project in Adult Functional Literacy Education.
  North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges.
- ESEA Title I Evaluation: District of Columbia.
  District of Columbia Public Schools.
- Educational Policy Development Center for Educational Quality and Improvement.
  Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/Policy Development.